

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action dated February 18, 2005 is respectfully requested. Applicants petition the Commissioner for a 2-month extension of time. A separate petition accompanies this amendment.

I. Amendments

The specification is amended to correct obvious typographical errors.

Claims 1-45 stand canceled.

The basis for new claims 46-63 is shown in the table below.

No new matter is added by way of amendment.

Claim No.	Basis
46	See page 5, lines 4-5, page 3, lines 22-28, and page 4, lines 9-15.
47	See page 4, lines 13-14
48	See page 4, lines 15-17.
49	See page 9, lines 32-34.
50	See page 10, lines 7-8.
51	See page 9, liens 2-4.
52	See page 10, lines 12-15.
53	See page 9, lines 8-10.
54	See page 5, lines 1-2.
55	See page 5, lines 7-15.
56	See page 5, lines 25-28.
57	See page 6, lines 8-11.
58	See page 6, lines 13-15.
59	See page Fig. 1, which shows the supply channel (S) and the drain channel (D) on

	the same side of the electrolyte channel.
60	See page Fig. 1.
61	See page 5, lines 17-21.
62	See page 5, lines 17-21.
63	See page 8, lines 31-33.

II. Interference Request

The Examiner's comments regarding the non-filed Request for Interference are duly noted. Applicants will not a formal Request for Interference under 37 C.F.R. §1.607 at this time. However, Applicants reserve the right to file such a Request at a later date.

III. Obvious-type double patenting rejections

Claims 19-21, 27-32, and 35-45 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 3, 4, and 16-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,280,589.

Claims 19-21, 27-32, and 35-45 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting as allegedly unpatentable over claims 3, 4, 11, and 16-17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,423,198.

Claims 19-21, 27-32, and 35-45 stand canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the obvious-type double patenting rejections.

IV. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 19-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 19-45 stand canceled. Basis for new claims 46-63 is given above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35

U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

V. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

Claims 19-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 19-45 stand canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

VI. Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objected to the length of the abstract. Applicants submit herewith a replacement Abstract. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the Abstract.

The Examiner further objected to the title. Applicants have amended the title in accord with the Examiner's kind suggestions.


Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully requested.

If in the opinion of the Examiner a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (650) 838-4410.

Respectfully submitted,


Jacqueline F. Mahoney
Registration No. 48,390

Date: July 7, 2005

Correspondence Address

Tel: (650) 838-4300

Customer No. 22918